WILLIAM & MARY DARLINGTON
MEMORIAL LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Dar.
P11
A51
V.9

Darlington Memorial Library

American Philological Association.

1876-7.

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

BALTIMORE, Tuesday, July 10, 1877.

The Ninth Annual Session was called to order at 4 o'clock P. M., at the Johns Hopkins University, by Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, Vice-President.

An address of welcome was made by Mr. John T. Morris, President of the School Board of the city of Baltimore, to which the Vice-President replied.

The Secretary being absent, Professor J. M. Garnett, Principal of St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., was elected Secretary of the meeting.

A report was presented from the Executive Committee, announcing that the persons whose names follow had been elected members of the Association:

Mr. C. C. Bates, Plymouth, Mass.; Professor E. S. Holden, Washington, D. C.; Professor C. K. Nelson, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.; Professor Austin Stickney, late of Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.; Professor W. B. Webster, Military Institute, Norfolk, Va.; Rev. R. F. Weidner, Phillipsburg, N. J.

The Treasurer presented his report, showing the receipts and expenditures of the past year to be as follow:

RECEIPTS.

Balance in treasury, July, 1876,	$692.52
Fees of new members and annual assessments,	400.00
Interest,	43.75
Sales of publications,	45.00
	$1,181.27

EXPENDITURES.

Printing Transactions, 1875,	$234.47
Printing Proceedings, 1876,	168.60
Expenses of New York meeting,	77.90
Postage, expressage, stationery, etc.,	27.79
Profit and loss (coupon unpaid),	17.50
	$526.26
Balance in treasury,	655.01
	$1,181.27

1.72.28 Chivers 35784 1.50 Harlington - Reading

The Association is the owner of one bond of the Connecticut Western Railroad for $500.00, on which there are three unpaid coupons of $17.50 each.

On motion, Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull and Professor C. H. Toy were appointed Auditors of the Treasurer's report.

A paper on "Temporal Coincidence of the Aorist Participle with the Primary Verb," by Mr. Augustus C. Merriam, of Columbia College, New York City, was read by Dr. C. R. Lanman.

It has been pretty generally conceded that the aorist participle with *λανθάνω*, *τυγχάνω*, *φθάνω*, *περιοράω*, *ἐφοράω*, and some other verbs, does not represent time past with reference to the primary verb, but coincides with it in time. But beyond its occurrence with the first three verbs just named, this usage does not appear to have been remarked in the Homeric poems. The question as to the admissibility of a wider use of it there presents itself in *ϑ* 564, where Alcinous, speaking to Ulysses of a prediction of his father's, says:

ἀλλὰ τόδ' ὦς ποτε πατρὸς ἐγὼν εἰπόντος ἄκουσα.

There is nothing in the context to determine whether he means, "I heard my father say," or, "I heard (from another) of my father's having said." The usual construction of the tense requires the latter. Is the former allowable? Upon a consideration of all the instances of *ἀκούω* with the participle in Homer, it becomes apparent not only that the former is admissible, but that it is the probable rendering.

Take first *ι* 497, where Ulysses is washed back by the refluent wave produced by the mass of rock hurled before his vessel by the Cyclops, and has pushed off again in silence out of reach. He then, wishing a second time to taunt the monster, is addressed by his comrades, who beg him to restrain himself, declaring that they thought themselves dead men when driven to shore, and they add:

εἰ δὲ φθεγξαμένου τευ ἢ αὐδήσαντος ἄκουσεν,
σύν κεν ἄραξ' ἡμέων κεφαλάς, κ. τ. λ.,

"If he (Polyphemus) had heard any one of us cry out or utter a word, he would have broken our heads."

Secondly, as the supreme crisis of the Odyssey is drawing on, the disguised Ulysses accompanies Philoetius and Eumaeus without the palace and asks them what part they would take in case their old master suddenly returned. They both respond with the fervent prayer that he may come and promise they will show him what might is theirs in his behalf. He thereupon discloses himself to them and says (*φ* 210):

τῶν δ' ἄλλων οὐ τευ ἄκουσα
εὐξαμένου ἐμὲ αὖτις ὑπότροπον οἴκαδ' ἱκέσθαι,

"Of the others not one have I heard pray that I again homeward might return."

Thirdly, in K 276, as Ulysses and Diomed are starting out upon their nocturnal scouting expedition, Athene sends a heron close by their pathway, and "they saw it not with their eyes through the night's darkness, but they heard it scream":

τοὶ δ' οὐκ ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν
νύκτα δι' ὀρφναίην, ἀλλὰ κλάγξαντος ἄκουσαν.

Again, when Ulysses in disguise is struck in the banqueting hall with a footstool by Antinous, the poet says (ρ 492):

τοῦ . . . . . ἤκουσε περίφρων Πηνελόπεια
βλημένου ἐν μεγάρῳ,

"Penelope in the women's apartments heard him when struck."

Here are four crucial instances where the context shows beyond any doubt that the act of hearing is an immediate one, and that the aorist participle stands as regards time for the common prosaic present which meets us so frequently in Xenophon and Plato.

In short, the instances of participial construction in Homer after ἀκούω and the kindred verbs κλύω, αἴω, πυνθάνομαι, ξυνίημι, may be grouped under two general heads:

I. Where the object of perception is *immediate*, and falls directly under the sense, i. e., one hears such and such a thing with his own ears.

II. Where the object is only *mediate*, i. e., one hears from another that such and such a thing is so.

Under I., the following passages may be cited where the aorist participle occurs, and these are best divided into three classes; (a) where the primary verb means simply to hear; (b) to hear with implied idea of heeding and granting prayer; (c) to hear with implied idea of heeding and obeying:

I. (a). ϑ 564, ι 497, φ 210, K 276, ρ 492, Υ 380, B 182, K 47, Π 76, δ 505.
(b). A 380, Π 531, A 453, Π 236.
(c). Z 281, γ 337.

The instances of the present participle belonging here are:
(a). O 506, κ 221, A 396, Φ 475, ϑ 95, 534, δ 76, K 189, Λ 463, μ 265.
(b). Π 515, ζ 325, I 509, T 77.
(c). O 199, β 423, τ 419.

II. Aorist Participle:
δ 728, β 375, δ 748, P 377, N 521, P 427, T 322, 337, ρ 115.
Present Participle:
λ 458, α 289, β 220, Ω 490, π 301, H 129, γ 94, δ 324, A 257, δ 732.
Infinitive: Z 386.

It will be remarked that we have under I., sixteen cases of the coincident aorist to fifteen of the present participle, not reckoning phrases repeated. If the six cases of (b) and (c) belonging to both tenses be put aside as admitting the more common explanation (and while this is possible, it is quite unnecessary in the light of the present investigation), the aorist participle has a majority of one over the present, demonstrating that this usage of the aorist was a deeply rooted one in the early stage of the language. And yet, in all the instances under II., where the object is mediate and secondary, the usual distinction of tense is fully maintained.

This coincident use of the aorist after verbs of hearing I do not find in the Homeric hymns, in Hesiod, Pindar, Aeschylus, or Xenophon, although full indexes have been examined. In fact, I have met with only two instances outside of Homer: one in a fragment of the poet Xenophanes (6), and the other in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius (i. 278).

Such circumstantial participles as φωνήσας (Δ 284, α 122, et saepe), ῥθεξάμενος (K 139, Ω 170), ἀύσας (Δ 508, Z 66, N 413), ὁμοκλήσας (E 439, Z 54), ἐπευξάμενος

(Z 475), ἀπειλήσας (φ 368, Π 225), usually preceding a speech and accompanying a verb of saying, as for example, σφεᾶς φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (a usage continued through into New Testament Greek, where the phrase ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν is very common), have been explained by Classen as inceptive, in the sense of "having lifted up the voice," "having begun to pray," etc. But the question becomes a pertinent one whether this apparent awkwardness of expression may not find its explanation in the same use of the tense which has been proved to exist after verbs of hearing. The common καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, would readily bear the rendering, "and to him in speech winged words he spake"—the participle referring merely in an indefinite way to the time embraced by the primary verb. The numerous instances of present participles also occurring in these phrases show the same interchange as after the verbs of hearing.

Mr. E. G. Sihler, of Johns Hopkins University, read a paper on "A Comparative Review of the Accounts of the Battle of Salamis given by Herodotus and Aeschylus."

Editors of Aeschylus's *Persae* or of Herodotus have of course been in the very proper habit of illustrating their commentaries from the other author respectively; and one of the latest writers on Greek History, Mr. Cox, seems to consider the battle of Salamis a morsel from which nothing more may be gotten. But within the last few years two valuable contributions by Kirchoff and Wecklein have appeared, on which this paper is based. In the introductory portion three questions were proposed:

(1.) What indications are there found in Herodotus himself about his own sources of information? Herodotus emphatically designates himself as a gatherer and preserver of tradition, mentioning any specific authority but rarely, and then mostly in conflicting traditions.

(2.) What were the intentions of the author? They were fair and his veracity is unquestionable. Of bias and prejudice but little is noticeable. At the same time, the tradition which he gathered could not but be to some extent colored by several factors; such as the tendency of allowing no blemish on the picture of past grand national events, or the sectional and personal dissensions and feuds, or the religious and moral conception of the author himself.

(3.) What did Herodotus know of existing literature? He knew it minutely and critically, and, not least, the dramas of Aeschylus, though mentioning him but once (II. 156).

The more detailed comparison of the two accounts was begun with Persae 337 sqq. and Herodotus VIII. 75.

The results were these: Herodotus takes Aeschylus into most accurate consideration throughout. Where Aeschylus gives only a general and poetical picture, Herodotus adds specifications of names, time, number, and locality. (Aeschylus from his Panhellenic standpoint forbears mentioning any names of individuals or commonwealths on the Greek side.) Again, where Aeschylus has been very explicit and detailed, Herodotus is satisfied with presenting a brief and concise summary. One of the most striking illustrations of this attitude is in the account of the massacre on Psyttaleia.

In treating of the Persian disposition of their fleet as caused by the Themistoclean message, the author believed himself to be able to show full harmony

between Aeschylûs and Herodotus; the τρεῖς στοῖχοι of Aeschylus being one line along the coast *in* the sound extending from Eleusis to the Piraeus, the second across the straits from Salamis to Munychia, and the third closing the western escape between Megaris and Salamis.

Grote's disbelief in the correctness of Herodotus's topographical propositions was exhibited as arbitrary and unwarranted. The plan of the battle which the author presented as his own comes nearest to that of Spruner, and differs most from that of Grote.

A paper by Professor Austin Stickney, late of Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., on "The Single Case-Form in Italian," was read by Mr. C. J. Buckingham.

The question as to which of the old Latin cases was the prototype of the single forms which remain in the declension of the Romanic languages, has been often discussed, but is still unsettled. The various views may be conveniently arranged under three heads. According to the first, the simple ground-form remains, divested of the old case-endings and clothed in such new guise as each particular language has chosen. The second opinion is that we have in the modern nominal forms the remains of some specific case, differing in various countries, the survival being in virtue of something like conscious choice or logical necessity. Those who maintain the third view hold that the modern case-form is the phonetic result of the wearing away of the old endings, in consequence of which the cases came to coincide in a single form.

The facts of the phonetic decay of Latin are generally conceded; its results differ, of course, in various countries. In France, it left a tolerably symmetrical system of declensions, owing to the persistence of the final *s*, and the general loss of the syllables after the tonic. In Italy, the paroxytones were tolerated or even favored, and the old endings remained vigorous much longer and in greater variety.

But phonetic decay, while it explains very well the singular number in Italian, is quite insufficient for the plural. After an examination of the facts as they appear in the language, it would seem that a complete statement of the origin of the nominal form should be made somewhat as follows: The present case-form is the result of the phonetic decay of the old Latin forms; but whenever this alone would have left more than one form for a number, there was a sort of natural selection, resulting in the survival of that one which, from its phonetic character, best suited the habits of the people using it, or which, oftener recurring in ordinary language, impressed itself more distinctly on the mind; in masculines and feminines, this was generally the continuation of one of the oblique cases, chiefly the accusative; in neuters, generally of the common form of the nominative and accusative; and when the present form is a new one, it has been made after certain analogies already existing in the old language.

A recess was then taken till 8 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION.

The Association was called to order by the President, Professor S. S. Haldeman, of the University of Pennsylvania.

The Secretary reported the election of a new member:

Professor Jacob Cooper, New Brunswick, N. J.

Professor W. D. Whitney, of Yale College, New Haven, Conn., read the first paper of the evening, on "Surd and Sonant."

Professor Whitney said that the true nature of the distinction between, for example, a *p* and a *b*, or an *f* and a *v*, had long been one of the disputed points in phonetics; for some time past there has seemed to be a decided tendency to agreement among phonetists in the acceptance of the opinion that the *b* and *v* get their distinctive character from accompanying vibrations of the vocal chords; but, very recently, there are signs of a reversal of this movement, seeming to render a new discussion of the point desirable.

It is generally conceded that the English *v* (along with the other so-called "sonant" consonants) does actually differ from its correspondent "surd," *f*, by an accompanying sonancy or tone. It is also well established that through a great part of Germany, at least, there is no sonancy in either member of any such pair, but, instead of it, a difference in force of utterance, the *v* etc. being weaker. The question at issue concerns the relation and the comparative value of these two kinds of difference.

It may fairly be claimed by those who practise the English mode of distinction that in their utterance the difference of force is of no account whatever. Either *f* or *v*, either *p* or *b*, may be and is pronounced with every possible degree of force, without any detriment to its individual identity. The same is true of them as of all our alphabetic elements. The genesis of an *e* or an *i*-sound is usually and regularly by a phonetic "weakening" of an *a*-sound: but an *i* strongly pronounced does not become an *a*, nor an *a* weakly pronounced an *i*. Just so with an *f* in its relation to a *p*. The *a* or *i* or *f* or *p* or *v* or *b*, once worked out as a constituent of the alphabetic system, may be uttered, unimpaired, with the whole range of force, just as of length or quantity, and just as (in the case of the sonant elements) of pitch.

But then, as alphabetic distinctions are capable of being founded on differences of quantity (as in the case of the long and short vowels), or on differences of pitch (as in the case of the Chinese tones), just so a difference in force of utterance of the same articulated sound may rise to absolute value in an alphabet. A great part of the German people, we are told, have no sonant *b* or *v* (and so on), but instead of them a weaker non-sonant correlative to *p* and *f*. Such a sound is an essentially different thing from the other; the two may be historical equivalents, but they are in no proper sense phonetic equivalents: witness the fact that, to real utterers of a sonant *b*, a German is distinctively one who inextricably mixes and interchanges his *b*'s and *p*'s. If, now, it can be shown that the Indo-European and Sanskrit-Greek-Latin *b* was not a sonant counterpart of *p*, but a weakened counterpart, then this German sound has a right to the name *media*, and to the sign *b*. But if (as is generally and doubtless correctly held) the sonant pronunciation is the older and more original one, and the weakened pronunciation without sonancy a later and locally restricted substitute for it, then the name and sign properly belong only to the English *b*, and not to the German, which is rather to be called a weak *p*.

Of course, the question whether and why the sonant letter alone is in practice subjected to a weakened utterance is one by itself, quite independent of the other.

The writer examined in detail some of the objections recently brought against these views—especially those presented by Professor Sievers, of Jena, in his valuable manual of Indo-European phonetics—and endeavored to show that they are insufficient or untenable.

Professor J. B. Feuling, of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., next presented a paper on "The Rime in Latin and Greek Poetry."

This paper was prepared by the author with reference to a resolution of the Executive Committee adopted at the fourth annual meeting of this Association: "*Resolved*, That a section of Linguistic Pedagogics be established in this Association, to which section shall be referred for discussion all papers respecting methods of teaching," etc.

The author stated that he would not have thought of bringing the subject before the Association if it were not for the entire neglect into which the rime seems to have fallen in the reading of Greek and Latin poetry. The view of Mr. George P. Marsh expressed in his *Lectures on the English Language* that it was a rule of both Greek and Latin composition to avoid all coincidences of sound, has caused undoubtedly this apparent neglect in the present generation.

The rime is found in its three-fold form, in the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of words; or, as the Germans call it, *Anreim*, *Inreim*, and *Endreim*. In Plautus we find the *Anreim* (alliteration) so frequently as to conclude that all verses which the poet wished to emphasize were adorned with alliterations. There seems to be no doubt that in early Roman poetry, which relied more on accent than on quantity, alliteration had a similar importance to that which it had in old Germanic poetry.

Through the influence of Greek models quantity gradually prevailed over accent, and with it alliteration lost its ground. In the later classical period we find the *Anreim* not so frequently as the *Inreim* and *Endreim*, but the latter frequently enough to lead us to suppose it was employed intentionally, although poetry had lost its popular character.

In Greek the vowel system is less corrupted than in Latin; this fact was the cause of a greater variety of sounds which facilitated assonances and rimes so much that the poet felt obliged to avoid full *Endreims* lest his verse should become a jingle. Marsh's explanation of the difference between Homer and Hesiod in regard to the occurrence of rimes—"that the more numerous critical revisions which the works of Homer passed through eliminated some instances of what to the Greek ear was offensive"—is an assumption which overlooks the fact that *Anreim* and *Inreim* occur more frequently in Homer than in Hesiod. In the fragments of the lyric poets, in Pindar, and in the dramatists, the *Anreim* and *Inreim*, without counting the *Endreim*, occur so frequently in significant passages as to convince us that the rime was employed as a foil to the meaning.

Professor Fisk P. Brewer, of Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa, read the last paper of the evening, on "The Modern Greek Language in Cyprus."

The speaker referred to the several collections recently made by Greek scholars of the folk lore of different localities, as Crete, Trebizonde, and Cyprus. In the latter island Professor A. A. Sakellarios, now of Athens, resided and taught for several years, and took down from the mouths of the people their proverbs and conundrums, their nursery songs and lays and tales in prose, the whole constituting one hundred and seventy-three pages of vernacular Greek. The longer poems, some of them five hundred lines in length, occupy the first hundred pages of this book. They seem to have been composed at different periods, one of the earlier lays describing the capture of Cyprus by the Turks in 1571. Specimens of the minor verses were given, together with an outline of two of the prose tales. One of the latter had a resemblance to the old tale of the Attic tragedy respecting Oedipus and Jocasta.

The value of the collection is in the side-light it throws on the development of the language of ancient and modern Greece. This was illustrated especially by a discussion of the origin of the modern form of the verb 'to be' in the third person. An earlier form, from which it was probably derived, is very common in Cyprus. Examples were given of ancient words retained among the common people, and of new words not used elsewhere in Greece.

The scholars of modern Greece were greatly commended for their diligence in collecting the facts respecting the present state of their language.

The Association thereupon stood adjourned to 9 o'clock Wednesday morning.

Wednesday, July 11—Morning Session.

The Association resumed its session, the President in the chair. The Secretary reported the election of new members:

Rev. Cecil F. P. Bancroft, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.; Mr. Porter C. Bliss, Editor of *Library Table*, New York City; Rev. Richard E. Call, Mohawk, N. Y.; Professor William R. Harper, Denison University, Granville, O.; Professor John B. Kieffer, Mercersburg College, Mercersburg, Penn.; Dr. Charles R. Lanman, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; Mr. R. F. Leighton, now in Leipzig, Germany; Mr. William A. Reynolds, Wilmington, Del.; Mr. W. E. Thompson, Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, Lima, N. Y.; Professor A. B. Stark, Logan Female Institute, Russellville, Ky.

On recommendation of the Executive Committee, it was

Resolved, That the length of papers read before this Association be limited to thirty minutes, unless the time is extended by unanimous consent.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That this Association accepts, with thanks, the invitation to attend this evening a reception tendered to it by the Athenaeum Club.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed by the Chair to recommend a suitable time and place for the next meeting.

The President appointed as such committee, Dr. J. H. Trumbull, Professor C. H. Toy, Professor W. A. Stevens, Dr. George R. Entler, and Mr. T. C. Murray.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed by the Chair to nominate officers for the next year.

The President appointed as such committee, Professor W. W. Goodwin, President W. C. Cattell, Professor J. B. Feuling, Professor T. D. Seymour, and Professor W. B. Carr.

Professor Franklin Carter, of Yale College, read the first paper of the morning, on "The Views of Wilmanns respecting the Authorship of the Nibelungenlied."

Dr. Wilmanns (the successor of Simrock at Bonn) is a moderate Lachmannite, and has published a pamphlet—"*Beiträge zur Erklärung und Geschichte des Nibelungenliedes*"—claiming to establish the composite origin of the great Middle-German classic from internal evidence. His previous success with the Gudrun in proving what the Germans call a "contamination" or combination of two or more separate versions in that poem, was so marked as to leave in the mind of any candid reader a firm belief in his originality and insight. The present brochure will not lessen the respect which the former inspired. Starting in the latter theme of the poem from two propositions which are probable (but which one may hesitate to admit as certain), he goes by sure and regular steps to the detection and exhibition of, first, an old original Rudegersdichtung, a composition in which Rudeger and Kriemhild are the main characters and Dieterich had as yet no share in the action. This was the old basis of the latter third of our poem. He claims, second, that a poem or a part of a poem in which Dankwart was the main hero, was incorporated with this Rudegersdichtung, and brought about certain changes in it and rendered connecting interpolated verses necessary. In other words a Dankwartsdichtung was interpolated in the Rudegersdichtung. He claims to establish, third, that another poem in which Iring was the main hero was also incorporated in the Rudegersdichtung, but entirely independent of the insertion of the Dankwartsdichtung. Thus we should have R. and Da. for one form and R. and I. for another. But it is also plain to Wilmanns that the Dankwart poet takes cognizance of the modifications of the Rudegersdichtung by the poet who introduced Dieterich, so that the one form would be R. + Di. + Da., and the other remaining as before R. + I., we have for our Nibelungenlied, at least for our theme of it, the contamination of R. + Di. + Da. with R. + I.

Various steps in the analysis are open to criticism, but the main lines of proof (the premises being granted) are not easy to confute. Strong objections exist to some of Zarncke's positions taken in the *Literarisches Centralblatt* against Wil-

manus. His reference of the inconsistencies of the poem to the peculiar style of the poet assumes the unitary individuality of the authorship and thus begs the whole question. The distinction between Lachmann's lay theory and Wilmanns's combination is ignored by Zarncke. The question has been shifted by Wilmanns and the firing of the old guns is of little account. The artificial reasons in support of the Kürenberg hypothesis are seen to be unsubstantial in the light of a searching analysis. In a decision between those reasons and Wilmanns's steps the candid judge will accept the latter. But by reason of a want of absolute certainty in the premises, the exact lines of the versions cannot be insisted upon, and on this account it may be doubted whether Wilmanns's little book will command the assent that it really deserves.

A paper by Professor F. D. Allen, of Mt. Auburn, Cincinnati, O., on "A certain apparently Pleonastic Use of *ὡς*," was read by Professor T. D. Seymour.

The paper related to the expressions *ὡς ἄλλως*, *ὡς ἑτέρως*, and *ὡς αὐτως* (*ὡσαύτως*). After adverting to the unsatisfactory explanations hitherto current, the writer took the ground that the above phrases are simply the ablatives of *ὁ ἄλλος*, *ὁ ἕτερος* and *ὁ αὐτός* respectively, and mean strictly "in the other manner," "in the same manner." It is well known that the adverbs in *-ως* are in their origin simply the ablative case of their respective adjectives; and it may well be that in these expressions *ὡς* is the ablative of the article *ὁ*, not, as commonly, that of the pronoun *ὅς*. The use of the stem *ὁ-* for this adverb, in preference to the other article-stem *το-*, was illustrated by reference to the adverbs *ὧ-δε* and *οὕτως*. The writer furthermore disapproved the form *αὔτως* still defended by Nauck and others, and contended that *αὐτως* (from *αὐτός*) is the only correct spelling.

Professor W. W. Goodwin, of Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., next read a paper on "The Text and Interpretation of certain passages of the Agamemnon of Aeschylus."

The author remarked that it was wrong to suppose that no further light could be thrown on Aeschylus from inspection of the manuscripts, and instanced the reading *τὸ μὴ 'δέναι* (for *τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι*) in Agam. 1196, found by himself in Codex Venetus 616, where the necessary reading *τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι* has been believed to be merely a conjecture of modern scholars. See Hermann, who says "omnes *τὸ μ' εἰδέναι*." So late editors of the Agamemnon doubt whether *πορθεῖν* or *ποθεῖν* is the reading of Cod. Flor. in vs. 342; but *ποθεῖν*, which is adopted by Hermann chiefly on the authority of this MS., is found in no MS. at all, and the Cod. Flor. (like all the others) has plainly *πορθεῖν*.

The passages of the Agamemnon which were discussed are the following:

1. Vss. 105, 106: *ἔτι γὰρ θεόθεν καταπνεῖει πειθὼ μολπᾶν, ἀλκὰν ξύμφυτος αἰών*. This reading of the MSS. was defended against the common emendations *μολπᾶν* and *ἀλκά*.

2. Vss. 249–254. Here the reading of the MSS. was defended against the modern substitutions, which can hardly be called emendations. The reading advocated was:

δίκα δὲ τοῖς μὲν παθοῦσιν
μαθεῖν ἐπιρρέπει· τὸ μέλλον δ'
ἐπεὶ γένοιτ' ἂν κλύοις· προχαιρέτω·
ἴσον δὲ τῷ προστένειν.
πορὸν γὰρ ἥξει συνορθὸν αὐταῖς.

This is the original reading of the Medicean MS., with the addition of *δ'* after *μέλλον*, and the obvious correction *ἐπεὶ γένοιτ'* (as other MSS. have it) for *ἐπὶ γένοιτ'*. The fac-simile of the Codex Medicens, published by Merkel at Oxford in 1871, gives *τὸ μέλλον· τὸ δὲ προκλύειν ἐπι γένοιτ' ἂν κλύοις, κ. τ. λ.* But *τὸ δὲ προκλύειν with the preceding colon* is inserted by a later hand with different ink. The position of *ἂν* with *κλύοις*, although preceded by the inserted clause *ἐπεὶ γένοιτ'*, is amply defended by such passages as Arist. Pac. 137: *ἀλλ', ὦ μέλ', ἂν μοι σιτίων διπλῶν ἐδεῖ.* No valid objection can be brought against *συνορθόν* (cf. *ἀνορθος, ἐξορθος*), which as an *ἅπαξ εἰρημένον* is not singular in Aeschylus. (See 6, below.) There is great force, finally, in the emphatic *αὐταῖς*, at the end of a passage which is chiefly parenthetic, recurring to the solemn expression (vs. 248) *τέχναι δὲ Κάλχαντος οὐκ ἄκραντοι.* The whole passage may be freely rendered thus (from vs. 247): "But what followed I saw not, and I speak not of it. I do say, however, that the prophetic arts of Calchas cannot fail to bring fulfilment (i. e. the vague horrors of Calchas's prediction in vss. 147–155 must surely be realized). But [it is only by actual experience that we shall ever *know* what is to be the penalty for the sacrifice of Iphigenia, for] Justice brings *knowledge* within the reach of those [only] who have suffered (*πάθει μάθος*); but the future you can hear of when it comes; before that bid it farewell, and this is as well as to lament it beforehand; [and one or the other we must do] for it will come clear and plain, in exact accordance with those (i. e. the forebodings of Calchas)."

3. In vs. 942 *νίκην τήνδε* was understood to mean *that kind of* νίκη, referring scornfully and sarcastically to *τὸ νικᾶσθαι* in vs. 941, as if *νίκη* could be the equivalent of *τὸ νικᾶσθαι* as well as of *τὸ νικᾶν*, as *τιμή* is equivalent to both *τὸ τιμᾶν* and *τὸ τιμᾶσθαι*. This interpretation, which is essentially that adopted by Paley, was defended against that advocated by Kennedy in a recent number of the Philological Journal.

4. In the difficult passage vss. 1025–1029, which can hardly be said to be *interpreted* at all by most of the explanations, notice was called to the strong antithesis of *μοῖρα* and *μοῖραν*, which gives the meaning: "But did not one fate appointed by the Gods hinder another (fate appointed by the Gods) from securing more than its due." This seems to point to a doctrine of "interference" of two lines of fate, by which either may be checked or balanced in a course which would, if unhindered, prove too destructive. This last desperate hope is all that the chorus can now see to warrant them in longer restraining their feelings *ὑπὸ σκότῳ.*

5. In vs. 1347, *ἀλλὰ κοινωσώμεθ' ἂν πως ἀσφαλῆ βουλεύματα*, the MS. reading *ἂν πως* (for *ἐάν πως*, sc. *ᾖ*) was defended, the meaning being "But let us take counsel together, in case there may be any safe plans (for us to adopt)," or "But, if any safe counsels shall occur to us, let us impart them to one another." The latter gives essentially the same idea, without emendation, as Hermann's *ἄν πως*, for *ἃ ἂν πως* (see Paley's note and translation).

6. In vs. 1599, ᾤμωξεν, ἀμπίπτει δ' ἀπὸ σφαγῆς ἐρῶν (vulg. ἐμῶν), it was contended that the MS. reading ἐρῶν should be retained, the simple ἐράω, in the sense of *vomit*, being amply supported by the compounds ἐξεράω, ἀπεράω, etc., though it does not elsewhere occur.

Professor W. D. Whitney, of Yale College, then read a paper on "The Principle of Economy as a Phonetic Force."

The tendency to economy of effort, or ease of utterance, has long been recognized as the dominant, if not the exclusively governing force in the phonetic changes of language. But, as is apt to be the case with such things, there is, on the one hand, an inclination on the part of some to make an improper use of the law, applying it in an artificial and mechanical way to the explanation of phenomena; and, on the other hand, by a natural reaction, some are beginning to doubt or deny the prevalence of any such law. Professor Whitney's paper was an attempt to correct both these tendencies, by defining more strictly the law in question, by pointing out the classes of facts already fully explained by it, as well as the remnant for which it is not yet made to account, and by showing the consistency of the law with all that we know thus far of the nature and history of language, and the extreme improbability that any other law of phonetic growth will be established in any degree whatever comparable with it. In the present imperfect state of our comprehension of linguistic facts, it would be premature to claim that everything is to be referred to this law; but there is also no reason for yet declaring any problematical phenomena inconsistent with it and proving it inoperative.

Professor C. K. Nelson, of St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., presented a paper on "Semitic Studies, especially as Illustrated in Hebrew, and their Relation to Modern Philology."

Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, of Johns Hopkins University, next read a paper entitled "Personal Reminiscences of Friedrich Ritschl."

In an association which numbers among its members devoted pupils of Ritschl, some mention should be made of the loss which not only classical philology but ideal philology, I may say, has sustained since we last met. Full of years, full of honors, but full of sorrows and sufferings as well, the master has passed away and left us rich with the record of his long and active and brilliant career, but poor by the loss of an incomparable teacher, of a gracious and loving friend. The philologian Ritschl, the great Latinist, the restorer of Plautus, the leader of Roman epigraphy, the keen critic, the unwearied student, a model to the last in his generous acquisition of new truth, of all these things others better fitted than I am have spoken; and recognizing the impertinence of praising a man who is above my praise, I am content to be silent of matters in which laudation would presuppose a right of judgment. But of Ritschl the teacher, Ritschl the friend, the humblest of his pupils and his friends has the right to speak. Germany has many learned men, and he who seeks learning there will not easily go astray; but after a longer sojourn he will find as he looks back that only

a few have been teachers to him. Of all mine—and I count among them Böckh with his regal sway over Hellenism, K. F. Hermann with his fervid copiousness of thought and illustration, Schneiderrin with his subtle appreciation of the Greek tongue—Ritschl made the deepest and most abiding impression. I first knew him in the time of his full vigor, at an age when enthusiasm and insight are oftenest found in beautiful balance; and while he never declined, but retained his power to the last, it seems to me that it was a privilege to have seen him when the glory of his achievements was fresh about his head, and when the school which he founded was aglow with its recent consecration. The atmosphere of his *auditorium* was an atmosphere of life. In other lecture-rooms it was possible to doze, and the drowsy stream of learning would trickle through the ear and the arm into the pen down to the paper, and the somnolent student might wake up at the end astonished at the vast amount of erudition which had been thus fixed in black and white. But no such lazy note-taking was possible in Ritschl's lecture-room, and indeed he had a sovereign contempt for the textual repetition of his every word. The traditional deification of the *heft* had no hold on Ritschl's discipline, as the master himself had no reverence for the published notes on the lectures of professors, no matter how worthy the professors may have been. The lecture was to stimulate, to impregnate, not simply to present a congeries of facts; and valuable as was the new material which Ritschl set forth, it was his method of combination and presentation, the scientific spirit, the earnestness and ardor of his delivery that made his lectures so memorable. To follow one of his arguments was to watch the advance of a flying column; it had all the inspiration of a battle, the flush of a triumph. His work was everywhere thorough, everywhere clean in style. *Cum pulvisculo exhaurire* was one of his favorite expressions. Exhaustive thoroughness in research, and sharp, clear, nervous expression of result are rarely paired as they were in him. A healthy model as well as an inspiring. But what shall I say of the divining-rod with which he revealed the springs of life within each pupil? To be with such a man was to become conscious of a higher scientific purpose; to listen to his kind words of encouragement was to rise to a sense of a noble vocation. Ritschl's life has many lessons for us all. He was the model of a classical philologian and the model of a university teacher, but the great lesson of all is the great lesson of the one most perfect life led on earth. He loved his work, he loved those who worked with him, and when I think of the stilted bearing of so many inferior men, the professional stiffness of so many who are nothing if not professors, I contrast with these the simple kindliness of the prince of German philologians, and I thank God that I early learned to love and admire and emulate the spirit of this great scholar. All cannot be Ritschls, but we can all be honest, and we can all strive to cast out the besetting sin of self-contained arrogance, which is too apt to mar even the fairest work of the philologian's life. And let this word of exhortation close this feeble testimony to the departed master, teacher, friend.

The last paper of the morning, by Dr. William J. Hoffman, of Reading, Penn., entitled "Notes on the Migrations of the Dakotas," was read by Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull.

The writer's personal observations amongst various tribes of Indians, from Lake Superior westward, and through Nevada, California, and Arizona south-

ward, and even into Mexico, illustrated the fact that there was either a difference of origin or an immense gap since the time of their breaking up into bands, tribes, and sub-tribes. He regards the idea that these tribes are from one stock, as not worth the time of a second thought. In seeking answers to the questions, Whence come the Dakotas? and, By what course did they reach the country at present occupied by them? the only safe course is to trace, as far as possible, the historical and traditional progress of the Dakotas, keeping their language as our safest guide, until even that becomes lost in a conglomeration of dialects from which there is no perceptible outlet. Whether the comparisons presented in this paper exhibit coincidences that are results of *intrusion*, or actual affinity, is submitted to the consideration of philologists.

These comparisons are introduced by remarks on the recent history, the traditions, and the geographical position of the Dakotas. Dr. Hoffman regards the Asiatic origin of this family as pretty well established. He alludes to various indications of the Asiatic origin or affinity of tribes on the Upper Pacific coast, and to the similarity, pointed out by Professor Roerig (*Smithsonian Report*, 1871, pp. 434, *et seqq.*), in the grammatical structure of the Dakota and Ural-Altaic languages. The affinity of the Dakota to languages of the west and southward is more particularly considered. In the comparison, preference is given to the so-called *Teton* dialect of the Dakota, which, as Dr. Hoffman believes, retains its original purity and is less corrupted than other Dakota dialects by foreign words. The Teton is spoken by the One-pá-pas, "Cut Heads," "Blackfeet," and "Two Kettles"; and these sub-tribes lived in the vicinity of the writer's station, communication with them being frequent. The Yanktonais were also frequent visitors. The difference between the Teton and Yanktonai dialects consists, chiefly, in the use of *d* and *n* by the Yanktonais, in the place of the Teton *l*.

Dr. O. Loew, in his report on the ethnology of Southern California and adjacent regions, has noticed the fact that the words for 'water,' 'hand,' and 'bird,' seem to have the same root in many western languages which otherwise are totally distinct. He observes that the radical *ma* in words for 'hand' can be traced as far south as Brazil, but is not found east of the Rocky Mountains nor with the Esquimaux, and that the syllable *pa* for 'water' is not found east of the Rocky Mountains, though of frequent occurrence in the west and southwest. Reproducing Dr. Loew's tables, Dr. Hoffman suggests that, though the Dakota name for 'hand' is *na-pe* ('right hand' *etape*, 'left hand' *chalka*,) yet, in all proper names, we find the word *ma-chpa*, as *Mach'pa Lúta* = 'Bloody Hand' (or "Red Cloud" as that famous warrior is known among the tribe); the name originating in his habit of besmearing his hands with the blood of his victims. The same syllable survives in other names in which the word 'hand' occurs. We have, also, the radical *m* or *ma*, in Aztec *ma*, *toma*, *maitl*, and Mosquito *mita*. Again, among the Pueblos, we find

Keres, *marquin*; *nash'-kai-ni*;
Acoma, *ha-match-ti i-ni*;
Kioway, *mor'ta*;

And we can trace the similarity to Dakota *nape*, *etape*, and *chalka*, in Keres NASH-KAI-ni, Aztec TOMA, MAITL, Tschuktchi *tatlichka*. In these, there appears, to the writer, to be some similarity, although they may prove to be mere coincidences. The syllable *pa* or *pal* for 'water,' found in many western

dialects (and in languages of the eastern continent), disappears in Dakota *mini*, but in all other Dakota words having reference to water (as, 'stream' or 'river'), with few exceptions, we find *pa-la:* e. g. the Yellowstone and Heart Rivers are known to the Dakotas, respectively, as *Ech-á ka-ha Wak-pá-la* ('Buck-Elk Creek') and *Chante Wak-pá-la* (or *Shanté Wakápla*). Dr. Hoffman notes, also, the similarity of the Dakota *mini* 'water,' with the Hebrew *ma-ym*, and with Esquimaux names, in several dialects, as well as with the Japanese *mitsu* and German *meer*; which, he thinks, "may result from Asiatic origin of the Esquimaux on one side, and a similar source of the Hebrew on the other." In another table he shows that the syllable *tsi* for 'bird' occurs in many Indian languages, including the Dakota, as well as the Chinese, Japanese, and Esquimaux names: and in several other tables, he exhibits the evidences of relationship in words for 'father,' 'mother,' 'head,' 'stone,' 'earth,' 'tree,' etc., in the Dakota and various languages of the west and southwest—and, occasionally, in Chinese, Japanese, and Hebrew.

In conclusion, he observes, *First:* that, accepting the theory and facts that some of our races are of Asiatic origin, and that a similar one has, with good reasons, been claimed for the Dakotas, we find that their migration was northward from the borders of Mexico, or near it, from the fact that the present Indians have dialects closely allied in many terms, which can scarcely have resulted from *intrusion. Secondly:* that, accepting the numerous affinities with dialects of California, which are, in turn, allied to Oriental languages, we may trace the start of their migration from the Pacific coast of the lower portion of California. *Thirdly:* that their migration was eastward from this point, before the Aztec migration southward, or after the Pueblos and Cliff Dwellers departed upon their journey into Mexico—this latter hypothesis being scarcely plausible; and *Fourthly:* if we permit the mythology of the Dakotas to influence our investigations, they at one time lived in a "Land of Flowers and Lakes," to which frequent reference is made in their romances, dreams, and tales of remote times, and in which some of them hope to live hereafter.

A recess was then taken till 3 o'clock.

Afternoon Session.

The Association met, Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, Vice-President, in the chair.

The Secretary reported the following names of new members:

Major John W. Powell, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Elizabeth Thompson, New York City.

The President, Professor S. S. Haldeman, delivered his address.

After giving an account of the recent progress of philological studies and enumerating several recent works illustrating them, he proceeded to speak of the reform of English spelling.

An association like ours should pay constant attention to the English tongue, its antecedents, its grammar, and the inherent laws of speech from which its

pronunciation should be deduced, instead of the vagaries of an uncertain alphabet, which misleads even the most careful orthoepists of the empiric school, who have been accustomed to regard its combinations as of more importance than the speech they are conventionally supposed to represent. Without an alphabet adapted to our speech, our spelling has not been controlled by science, or even by common sense. It is so perverse that its use constitutes a superstition. It may be compared to an incubus which presses words from the natural course of their development, and gives us many spurious forms which are retained by the despotic power which imposed them—a power which allows ignorance to pervert words and spellings at discretion, but forbids intelligence to restore them. The old English spellings, 'sovran' of Milton, and 'forain' of Chaucer, have given way to forms in which *g* has been ignorantly placed, and we are required to write *l* in 'could,' which never had an *l* in speech. We also use *l* to a great extent merely as a mark to indicate length in vowels (as in 'chalk,' 'calm'). This perversity in the use of *l* is exceeded in that of *u* in connection with *q*, a letter made for a sound somewhat like *k*, but different. It is heard in the Semitic languages and occurs in many biblic names, such as Ezeqiel, Rebeqâh, Jaqōb. In Latin the use of a single letter (*v*) for the vowel of 'ooze' and the consonant of 'wo' was inconvenient, and the difficulty was partiali obviated where a *cay*-sound preceded, by writing this with *q* as an indication that the succeeding *u* was consonantal, as in the English derivatives 'quart,' 'quiet.' In time, however, the *u* in *qu* was neglected, and this combination of letters became the representativ of *cay* alone, as in Spanish and French, where *qui* spells *kee*. Being without *k*, it should have seemed natural to take *q* instead, but according to the demand of a literary superstition, *q* and *u* must not be separated, as they constitute but one letter.

The *cay*-sound having been properly represented in the Roman alphabet, it was not at any time proper to use *q* or *k* for it; old spellings should have represented old sounds and new letters should have been adapted to new sounds. But when the *cay*-sound was replaced by others, a system of expedients was introduced which has caused the absurd combination *ch* to have a different power in German, French, Italian, and Spanish. The absurdity is fourfold in English which has adopted all of these powers, the German in 'loch,' the French in 'chaise,' the Italian in 'architect,' the Spanish in 'chirp.'

The adoption of the French rule that *c* is a form of *s* before certain vowels, as in the book-word 'cist' beside the speech-word 'chist' and its corruption 'chest' (Latin *cista*, Gr. κίστη), has led to the formation of spurious words, for certainly there is no law of English speech which requires 'sacc-iform' (sack-shaped) to be called *saxiform* (rock-shaped) or 'sceptic' to be spoken of as *septic*; or that should prevent the noun 'talc' from being present in the adjective *talc-y*, no matter under what spellings they appear.

English started as Anglish (Anglosaxon), taking Norman and interfusing with it, each having its own scale of sounds and mode of spelling. As a descendant of Anglosaxon, English should have preserved its alphabet, with such additions as were required by the new Norman sounds. But insted of making a proper adaptation, the Anglosaxon alphabet was mutilated, two consonant letters common to Islandic, representing the lisped sounds of *thin* and *then*, were replaced with *th*, the uniform Roman *cay* was aided with a useless *k* and *q*, as in 'king' for *cing*, and 'queen' for *cven*, with true Latin *e* of *vein*. The letter used for

the rare Celtic (i. e. Keltic) vowel of 'apple' (Angl. *æpl*) was rejected and the universal *a* (*ah* of 'arm') not only set in its place, but also perverted for the vowel in 'sane,' 'bait,' 'vein,' 'they.' The vowel letter *y*, legitimately representing Greek *υ*, Danish *y*, German *ü*, French *u*, was assigned to the initial consonant in 'year' (Angl. *gear*, Ger. *jahr*) where the letter is in fact a form of *g*; in 'my' it is a combination of *ij*; in the name of the Scotch grouse 'capercailzie,' and in the proper names 'Menzies' and 'Dalzell,' it is shaped like a *z*, for which it might be mistaken. Finally, a pseudomorphic *y* sometimes appears in imitations of old English print, where one of the characters for *th* was used, but this supposed old English 'ye' will be read *the*, when the reader is acquainted with the art of spelling.

The Normans brought in new sounds, particularly *dzh* and *tsh*, of which we print the former as in '*g*em,' '*j*udge,' '*j*ud*g*ment,' and the latter as in 'which,' 'hi*tch*,' but we omit the *d* in 'journal' from 'diurnal,' altho we retain the *d* of IUDEX in spelling 'judge.' For etymologic reasons we spell 'gem' with *g* and 'janitor' with *j*; nevertheless, we use both in the cognate words 'genteel' and 'jaunty'—forms of Latin *gentilis*; and we desert the etymologic idea in using *ge* in 'barge' from 'bark.' We spell the older word ('genteel') with the new modern *ee*, and pervert its proper spelling (*gentile*) to a later word with *i* as 'eye,' when in fact, the letters of 'gentile' formerly stood for *genteel*, for in old print of 1620 we read of a "Gentile [pronounced *genteel*] education." In all such cases, the new sound should have the new spelling.

The consonants *sh*, *zh*, being absent from Greek and Latin, nations having them were puzzled how to represent them, and insted of inventing or borrowing letters, they adopted excentric expedients. For *sh* the Germans used *sch*, which represent the sounds heard in Dutch *sch* (= *s-ch*, or *s* followed by guttural *ch*) as in Gr. σχολή, Dutch *school* (= *s-chōl*), Ger. *schule*, Eng. *school*. German *sch* also represents *sk*, as in *schrift*, Eng. *script*; and *s*, as in *schwalbe*, old Ger. *swalawa*, Eng. *swallow*. *Sch* was used in old English, but was soon shortened into *sh*, and now some reformers would have a character based on *sh*, which implies the absurdity of farther aspirating the aspirate *s* by adding *h*. Other examples of inconsistency in the use of letters were adduced.

It is time that the tyranny of the dictionaries should cease. The common people are at last aroused, demanding to be freed from nonsensical rules, and they will throw off the bonds which have hampered them so long.

Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull, of Hartford, Conn., then read a paper on "Cork, Orchel, and Jarrock."

Among the additions made to Johnson's Dictionary by its latest editor, Dr. Latham, is this:

"JARROCK [?] See Extract.

'Jarrock [is] a kind of cork or other ingredient, prohibited to be used in dyeing cloth.'—Jacob, Law Dictionary."

This vocable (in no sense, a *word*) has a curious history, which it may be worth while to trace. A statute of the first year of Richard III. (ch. 8) prohibited to dyers of cloth the use of "Orchell or Cork called *Jarecork*" ("Orchel ou Cork appellez *Jarecork*") except "the Cork made within the realm of England." In Rastell's and other early collections of English statutes,

"Jarecork" was mis-printed as "Jarrock" (or "Iarrock") and this pseudomorph passed into the dictionaries and became a recognized "term of the law." It appears in Cowell's *Interpreter* (1607):

"*Iarrock:* anno 1 Ri. 3, ca. 8. is a kinde of cork so called."

Minsheu, in his *Guide in Tongues*, 1617, probably copied it from Cowell:

"Iarrocke, a kind of corke so called mentioned anno 1 R. 3, ca. 8."

In subsequent editions of Cowell, the definition became more indefinite: "a kind of cork *or other ingredient* which this statute prohibits dyers to use in dyeing cloth." Sheppard's *Grand Abridgement*, 1675, gives it as "*Jurrock*—a kind of cork." The law dictionaries of Blount (1670), Jacob, Cunningham, Tomlins, Granger, Whishaw—and perhaps others—take the term, with the definition, from Cowell or Minsheu. So did the lexicographers, Phillips, Coles, and Bailey (through more than thirty editions). Johnson *omitted* it, but Ash (1775) restored it to the vocabulary, with the remark that it was "*not much* used"! It is admitted by both Halliwell and Wright, in their dictionaries of obsolete and provincial English, on the authority of Minsheu. Skinner is the only lexicographer who seems to have troubled himself to ask—or guess—*what* "sort of cork" was "made within the realm of England," in the fifteenth century, to be used for dye stuff. In his *Etymologicon* (1671) he questioned the accuracy of Cowell's explanation of 'Jarrock,' as "*suberis* genus"; yet he quoted it—and wondered whether the English name of cork might not be derived "à *Carucio*, olim *Carave*, Corsicæ insulâ oppido, unde olim istiusmodi Suber *fortasse* advectum sit"! None of the dictionary-makers who have so carefully preserved the no-word "Jarrock" appears to have suspected that the "cork" which "Jarrock" was defined to be, was—in dictionary acceptation—no cork; that it was not "*suberis* genus," but *lichenis* genus, one of the popular names of several species of lichens or stone-mosses that yield a red or purple dye, including those which are now better known as "cudbear," "crottel," and "archil" or "orchel" lichens.

"*Corke* or *Archall*, Lichen petræus purpureus Derbiensis," is described by Parkinson (*Theatrum Botanicum*, 1640, p. 1315) as "a kind of herb much resembling Liverwort, growing in Darbyshire upon the free stones of the mountains," from which "the poor people make a kind of murrie or purplish dye." Skinner, in his *Etymologicon Botanicum*, has "*Cork*, Hepatica petræa," and "*Arcel* Hepatica petræa purpurea Darbiensis." Dr. Wallis (*Hist. of Northumberland*, i. 277) says: "Our northern people seem to call all stone-mosses that yield a red or purple dye, *Cork*." The name is, evidently, from the Gaelic *corcur*, *corcra*, 'purple' or 'crimson.' The wonder is, how it has escaped the notice of the northern provincial glossarists and the more comprehensive collections of Nares, Halliwell, and Wright. Jamieson's Scottish Dictionary gives: "*Corkes*, the ancient name of the *Lichen omphalodes*, now in Scotland called *Cudbear*. Gael. *Corcar*, the *L. tartareus*."

Orchel—now commonly written "*Archil*"—the name by which the coloring matter obtained from various species of lichens is known in commerce and to dyers, has been as much of a stumbling block as "Jarrock," in the way of the lexicographers. It is the Italian *oricello*, Spanish *orciglia* and *orchilla*, French *orcheil*, *ursell*, and *orseille*. The preamble to the statute of 1 Rich. 3, c. 8, mentions "*orchell* and *corke* brought from beyond the Sea, called *Jarecork*." At

that period, the islands of the Mediterranean and the Canaries supplied most of the "orchel" used in Europe; though some, it appears, was "made in the realm of England." A statute of 3 and 4 Edw. 6, c. 2, permits the use of "good and sufficient corke or orchal," in dyeing some kinds of cloth. The *imported* orchel was, it appears, called 'Jarecork'—meaning, as I conjecture "*prepared* (A. S. *gearu*, Old Eng. *yare*) lichen," ready for the dyer's use.

Argal or *argol* was the popular name (still known in commerce) of the crude tartar deposited on the sides of wine casks. This was, probably, the "argoile" of Chaucer's Chanone's laboratory (C. T. 16281) which Tyrwhitt mistook for "potter's clay" (Fr. *argille*), and the "argaile" of Jonson's Alchemist (a. 1, sc. 1). Cotgrave translated Fr. *Tartre* by "Tartar or *Argall*." It was not easy to confound *orchel* with *argal*—but the lexicographers managed to do it. Cowell (*Interpreter*, 1607) gave, with reference to the statutes above-mentioned,—

"*Orchel, Orchall*, seemeth to be all one with cork";

and Minsheu repeats: "it seemeth to be all one with cork." Phillips (*New World of Words*) leaves it in this shape:

"*Archal;* otherwise called Darbyshire Liverwort," &c.
"*Corck*, or *Orchal;* a kind of blue colour used in painting."
"*Orchel* or *Orchal;* a certain stone like allum wherewith dyers use to colour red. In some old statutes it seemeth to be the same thing with Cork."

The editors of Cowell amended his definition. The edition of 1727 has: "*Orchel, Orchal*, seems to be a kind of cork, *or rather a kind of stone* like allum, which dyers use in their colours." Coles and Bailey have "*Archal*, Derbyshire Liverwort" and "*Orchal*, a stone like allum," etc—to which Bailey adds "*Argal*, Tartar, or hard lees," etc., and "*Orgal*, the lees of wine, dried and prepared, used by dyers," etc. Johnson omitted *Archal*, retaining (on the authority of Ainsworth) *Orgal*, "lees of wine," and *Orchal*, "a stone from which a blue colour is made." Sheridan and Walker copied Johnson. Of the Law Dictionaries, Cunningham's adopted the absurd un-definition of Cowell's—"a kind of cork, or rather a kind of stone"; Jacob's omitted the "cork"; Tomlins followed Jacob; and Whishaw copied from Cowell and Blount.

To recapitulate: *Jarrock*, which since 1607 has been recognized as a term of English law and admitted to English dictionaries, solely on the ground of its occurrence in a statute of the first year of Richard III., does *not* occur in that statute, or in any other. *Jarecork*, the term for which "Jarrock" was substituted by a printer's or copyist's error, is not to be found in English dictionaries. The "Cork" which "Jarrock" has been uniformly defined to be is *no* cork that is known to English lexicography. The "Orchel," which seemeth to be all one with the cork, is not—as the law dictionaries make it—identical with *Orgal* or *Argol*, crude tartar, and the latter is not "a kind of stone" nor is it mentioned in any of the ancient statutes to which the law dictionaries refer, under *Orchel*.

A paper by Professor Lewis R. Packard, of Yale College, New Haven, Conn., entitled "Notes on certain passages in the Phaedo and the Gorgias of Plato," was read by Dr. C. R. Lanman.

The passages commented on in the Phaedo were as follows: 61 c (suggesting εἰηνῷ· instead of εἰηνῷ;), 71 D (the use of τὸ τεθνηκός where τὸ τεθνάναι would

ordinarily be used), 78 A (*αὐτοίς* taken as the object of *ζητεῖν*), 79 D (on the reading *ὥσπερ* for *περί*), 86 E (on *ἤ* followed by *δέ*), 89 C and 107 A (on the general meaning of *ἕως ἔτι ᾧς ἐστίν* and *τὸν παρόντα καιρόν*, without reference to the death of Sokrates on that day at sunset), 97 D (*αὐτοῦ* in apposition with *ἐκείνου*), 99 C (that *τοῦ* belongs with *τεθῆναι* rather than with *κεῖσθαι*), 101 E (on the phrase *ἱκανοὶ δύνασθαι*).

Those in the Gorgias were 453 C (on Woolsey's suggestion of *ἢ οὐ* for *καὶ ποῦ*), 461 B (on the negatives in the sentence *ἢ οἴει—διδάξειν*;), 471 D and 486 C (on the probable irony in both places) 506 C–507 A (on the form of this mimic dialogue), 511 D (on the meaning of *καί* before *τὰ σώματα*), 512 A (to show that *οὐ* before *εἰ μέν* belongs not to *βιωτέον ἐστίν* alone, but to the whole statement in the two contrasted clauses taken together).

Professor W. W. Goodwin, of Harvard College, next presented a paper on "Greek Expressions of Future-perfect Time."

The object of this paper is to correct a common error, by which the Greek aorist subjunctive is said to express the same time as the Latin future-perfect indicative if it depends on a verb of future time. Thus *ἐὰν τοῦτο ποιῶσιν, φοβήσομαι* is said to be equivalent to *si hoc facient, timebo;* while *ἐὰν τοῦτο ποιήσωσιν, φοβήσομαι* = *si hoc fecerint, timebo.* The aorist subjunctive being thus made to some extent a *past* tense, so far at least that it denotes time past to the leading verb, it is said that when the leading verb is present the aorist subjunctive denotes time *actually* past, so that *ἐάν τι μάθωμεν, κέρδος ἐστίν* means *if we have (ever) learnt anything, it is a gain.* The same force *mutatis mutandis* is ascribed to the aorist optative. This view is distinctly stated by Krüger, *Griech. Spr.* § 53, 6, Anm. 5: "In rein und gemischt hypothetischen Sätzen haben der Conjunctiv und Optativ des Aorists regelmässig die Bedeutung der Vergangenheit, die aber, in sofern der Hauptsatz ein Zukünftiges bezeichnet, als erst bei dessen Verwirklichung eingetretene Vergangenheit vorgestellt wird, so dass diese Modi auch dem Lat. *futuro exacto* entsprechen." It is probably on the same principle that Professor Sewall (*Transactions* for 1874, p. 81) says of *ἣν προσμίξωσι* in Thuc. ii. 39, that "it is in the past, not future."

It is well known that the Greek has a future-perfect tense, which is competent to do the work done by the Latin future-perfect; but it is found only in a few verbs, and in the active voice it must generally be expressed by a cumbrous periphrasis, so that practically the tense is of little account in Greek syntax. The Greek perfect subjunctive is the nearest equivalent of the Latin future-perfect in dependent sentences, as *ἐὰν τοῦτο πεποιηκὼς ὦ, si hoc fecero;* the perfect optative here is future-perfect in time, as *εἰ τοῦτο πεποιηκὼς εἴην, if I should* (in the future) *prove to have done this.* But these forms are cumbrous, and their use was avoided. The Greeks here sacrificed exactness to harmony, and thus made little use of a distinction which in Latin was constantly observed. It is now assumed in the theory above stated that the aorist subjunctive at least partly fills this vacant place in Greek and expresses future-perfect time. But if *ἐὰν τοῦτο ποιήσω* means *if I shall have done this,* how does it differ from *ἐὰν τοῦτο πεποιηκὼς ὦ,* which clearly has this meaning? The truth seems to be, that the aorist subjunctive *of itself* never expresses future-perfect or perfect time, so that *ἐὰν τοῦτο γένηται* can mean only *if this shall happen* or *if this ever happens.* This tense may, however,

be introduced by a particle, like ἐπειδάν, *after that*, which throws the whole expression into time past relatively to the leading verb; so that ἐπειδὰν εἴπω means (according to the leading verb) *when I shall have spoken* or *when I have spoken*. But there is no more past force *in the verb* here than there is in μετὰ τὸ ἐμὲ εἰπεῖν, *after my speaking*. Further, as the leading verb on which a conditional subjunctive depends can never be strictly present, it follows that the subjunctive can never denote really past time. In fact we shall never find any evidence that such a subjunctive has by its own force what Krüger calls "die Bedeutung der Vergangenheit," which on all other grounds seems utterly opposed to the whole character of the Greek subjunctive.

It thus appears that the Greek often uses a less exact form, like ἐὰν τοῦτο ποιήσω, *if I shall do this*, where the Latin would use the more exact *si hoc fecero, if I shall have done this*. In many such cases it may be doubted whether the use of the English future-perfect in translating the Greek aorist subjunctive is objectionable, provided the context shows clearly that the subjunctive refers to time past relatively to the leading verb. But this is very different from maintaining that this past force is actually found in the aorist subjunctive itself. Instructive examples in this matter are ὃν μὲν ἴδῃ...κἂν...πεπόνθῃ, Plat. Rep. ii. 376 A, and ὅταν μὲν τιθῆσθε...ἐπειδὰν δὲ θῆσθε, Dem. Mid. § 34, p. 525, 11.

To this paper was added a remark supplementary to the paper on "Shall and Should" printed in the *Transactions* for 1876.

A confirmation of the opinion that the optative in protasis, when it is not past and generic, is properly designated as one of the forms used for expressing a future condition, and that this futurity is its most marked characteristic, is found in the criticism of Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Thuc. ii. 39: εἰ ῥᾳθυμίᾳ μᾶλλον ἢ πόνων μελέτῃ...ἐθέλοιμεν κινδυνεύειν, περιγίγνεται ἡμῖν, κ. τ. λ. Dionysius criticises ἐθέλοιμεν as an instance of ἡ παρὰ τοὺς χρόνους τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκβεβηκυία τὸ κατάλληλον φράσις, and makes the objection that ἐθέλοιμεν is a verb of future time while περιγίγνεται is one of present time. The difficulty would have been removed, he thinks, by substituting περιέσται for περιγίγνεται, thus making the apodosis also future. See Dion. Hal. de Thucyd. Idiom. 12 (p. 801 R.). Most modern scholars would criticise this sentence in a different way; and most editors accept the more regular reading ἐθέλομεν on poor authority, in spite of the quotation in Dionysius.

The Association thereupon adjourned till Thursday morning.

Third Day—Thursday, July 12.

Morning Session.

The Association met at 9 o'clock, the President in the chair.

The Auditors of the Treasurer's Report reported that they found it correct; and it was, on motion, accepted.

A paper by Professor Edward S. Holden, of the Naval Observatory, Washington, D. C., on "The Vocabularies of Children under Two Years of Age," was read by Professor W. D. Whitney.

The writer had been led, in the sequel of an inquiry earlier made into the extent of vocabulary of an educated adult, to examine further the subject of the extent of vocabulary commanded by young children. He chose the twenty-fourth month, the last of the second year, as the period for examination. All words actually used during that month were carefully noted down, with rigid exclusion of doubtful words, of nursery rhymes learned and repeated, and so on. The work was done by Professor Holden himself for two children, and he reports the results of a like work done by a friend upon a third child. The particular period was chosen because after the end of the second year words are learned so fast that the collection is attended with greatly increased difficulty and uncertainty. The collected vocabularies were presented in full, classified both as parts of speech and according to their initial letters, since it seems clearly apparent that early acquisition of words is determined in no small part by their comparative ease of pronunciation. The general results (omitting here the classification by initial letters) are as follows:

Children.	I.	II.	III.
Nouns, etc.,	285	230	114
Verbs, etc.,	107	90	29
Adjectives, etc.,	34	37	13
Adverbs, etc.,	29	17	6
Miscellaneous,	28	25	11
Totals,	483	399	173

The third child was one who showed considerable backwardness in utterance.

The result of Professor Holden's inquiry into the adult vocabulary (of which the method was fully explained) had been to show that an educated man has at command, out of those words which are admitted into Webster's Unabridged Dictionary (edition of 1852), about thirty-five thousand words, besides technical words, scientific and proper names, etc., not included in that work.

Professor William B. Carr, of Petersburg, Virginia, read the next paper, on "Virgil's Views of the Collective Noun."

The writer eulogized the poet's style, basing its superiority, in part, upon the philosophical accuracy of his powers of observation. He said that there was a single illustration of the manner in which Virgil employed these powers, on which he wished to remark. It was to be found in his peculiar method of contemplating and employing the collective noun. He then proceeded:

Other writers seem to take a photographic view of the object in nature before them, and reduce it immediately to a stereotype plate, which they lay away for any and every subsequent occasion. With Horace, the collective noun is always a unit; for example, *turba*, and *genus*, and *juventus* are each a unit; and, in the Carmen Saeculare, *chorus* is not only a unit, but a unit of the first grammatical person, an *ego: turba certat, genus haesit, juventus audiet, chorus reporto.* Of the thirty instances of the use of the collective noun in the lyric verses of Horace, every one corroborates this view. With Ovid, it is believed that the case is just the reverse; though it is hardly probable that he is as strict in the use of the plural as is Horace in the use of the singular.

Even nations seem to take this permanent view of some, at least, of the collective nouns. With English-speaking thinkers, *the people* has always been a many-sided

monster of the plural number; exceptions may be found in the Authorized Version of the Old Testament, and in the speeches of Kossuth. In France, on the other hand, *le peuple* is always singular; and so was the *Populus Romanus*, and even the *Senatus Populusque Romanus*.

But not so with our more philosophic author of the Aeneid. An enthusiastic admirer of nature, he lays bare his senses to her charms and receives his impressions fresh from their source. These impressions must, of course, vary according to standpoint and distance. Let a material object present itself to his philosophic eye, and though it be a group, a parcel, a collection, a multitude, he views it as a unit; but if he have occasion further to contemplate it and to take a second impression, his attentive gaze continues, the several objects that compose the group begin to assume a distinct individuality of their own; and there now come into view *men*, where before there was only a *crowd*, a *mob; soldiers*, where there had been but an *army; ships and sailors*, instead of a *fleet;* busy *bees* and industrious *ants*, instead of a teeming *swarm* or a black *battalion*.

Such being our poet's views of this matter, what are we naturally to expect, when such a noun is used as a subject, but that the first predicate verb, and accompanying adjective if there be one, shall be in the singular number, in accord with the noun as a unit; and that those verbs that follow in the same period, whether one or several, together with any accompanying adjectives or participles, shall all be plural? Now, in point of fact, *such is the case;* such is Virgil's usage, occasionally modified by the exigencies of the versification, but obviously his usage, whenever he is left free to exercise his preference.

Attention was then invited to a number of periods of the Aeneid, as follows, in proof of this position:

I. 148–152, where *vulgus* is attended by *saevit* and *silent*, etc.

II. 31–32, where *pars* is followed by *stupet* and *mirantur*, although the poet was under no metrical constraint to write *mirantur;* for the quantities left him at the most complete liberty to choose between *miratur* and *mirantur*.

II. 62–63, where *juventus* is followed by *ruit* and *certant*.

II. 214–219, where *serpens uterque*, tantamount to a collective noun, is followed first by two singular verbs and then by several plural ones.

III. 675–676, where *genus* is followed by *ruit* and *complent*.

IV. 86–88, where *juventus* is followed by *exercet* and *parant*. Here, as elsewhere, the numbers might have been reversed, or both verbs might have been singular, or both plural, without other change in the hexameters; so that the poet, being perfectly unconstrained by the requirements of the meter, has followed his canon and indicated his choice.

Other passages of the Aeneid, cited in proof and commented upon, are the following:

V. 33–34; VII. 573–576; VII. 687–689; IX. 74–75; XI. 608–610; XI. 880–883; XII. 122–124; XII. 562–564; and, on the best manuscript authority, though not according to the common editions, VI. 7–8; and IX. 174–175; (sixteen, in all.)

It was then shown that, in all those passages of this poem in which there were apparent exceptions to the rule, the departures arose from the fact that the requirements of the verse had obstructed the ready application of the rule, and in three instances modern editors had changed the text to suit their own notions of accord or of taste. These are:

I. 284–285; III. 233–234; V. 134–136; V. 862–863; VI. 218–219; VII. 813;

IX. 607–608: and, in VI. 642–644, it was suggested that plurals were employed in acknowledgment of the immense numbers of spirits seen by the hero in the several groups of the blessed in Elysium; a sort of *pluralis excellentiae* in the form of the verb.

In the only passage of the GEORGICS bearing upon the question, III. 382–383, the common editions have *gens* followed by *tunditur* and *velatur;* but the better authorized reading, and doubtless the correct one, is *velantur.*

The writer would turn this well established peculiarity of style to more practical account, and endeavor by means of it to settle the question of genuineness among certain doubtful readings, e. g.: between *monstrat* and *monstrant,* AE VI. 8; between *exercet* and *exercent,* AE. VI. 642; and between *velatur* and *velantur,* G. III. 383; and also would decide, by this means, the question of the authenticity of the CULEX, CIRIS, COPA, CATALECTA, MORETUM,* and HORTULUS, all of which have been attributed to Virgil, but whose authenticity is still matter of doubt. But inasmuch as there is not in these pieces a single period bearing upon the canon, we are limited to the usual means, internal and historical evidence. It is worthy of remark that the BUCOLICS have not this criterion, and yet are, without question, genuine. As to the twenty other pieces of the doubtful list, sometimes attributed to Virgil, few scholars, if any, of the present day seriously believe that any part of it, unless it be the DIRAE, was written by Virgil.

The author feels at liberty, therefore, to assert that Virgil must have laid down a rule for his own guidance in the premises, and that that rule may be reproduced in the form of the following CANON:

In connection with a collective noun as a subject, use first a singular verb; and then, if the predicate be compound, the verb or verbs that follow must be plural: never reverse this rule under any circumstances; but always adhere to it, unless when overridden by the stern exigencies of the meter.

Professor W. D. Whitney, of Yale College, next read a paper on "Cockneyisms."

Professor Whitney said that the so-called "Cockney" peculiarities of pronunciation, in regard to *v* and *w*, and the use or omission of initial *h*, have generally been viewed as direct interchanges—the *h*, for example, being added to all words where it does not belong, and dropped from all words which have a right to it. As such interchanges, they would seem to have a certain analogy with the conversions of "Grimm's Law." He had himself formerly referred to them as possessing that value; and recently an English writer, Mr. Douse, has founded chiefly upon them an elaborate attempt at explaining the phenomena of Grimm's Law, assuming a "dissimilating sentiment," followed by a "cross compensation," and so on. But it appears extremely doubtful, on careful consideration, whether there is any real analogy between the two classes of phenomena.

The English author referred to, following Marsh, brings up as an analogue to the Cockney practices a habit well known in America: namely, the leaving off and putting on of a final *r;* the saying of *doah* for *door* and of *lor* for *law,* and so on. Every one must have noticed the frequency of the added *r* among uneducated people, and especially among children. It would certainly be wrong,

* In this little poem occurs the phrase "*e pluribus unus.*"

however, to regard this as a case of interchange. The explanation seems to be plainly as follows. Among no small part of the English-speaking people, both in America and (by the testimony, for example, of Mr. A. J. Ellis) in England, no *r* is sounded at all unless it is directly followed by a vowel. So, in *for* and *color* the final *r* is entirely silent, and the words are sounded at the end precisely like *law* and (dialectic or vulgar) *holla* and *follow*. But the addition of another word or a derivative syllable beginning with a vowel brings the *r* to utterance, like the linked final consonant of a French word; and in *for and against* and in *coloring* the sound of *r* is plainly enough heard. The uneducated or unpracticed speaker, now, knows of no ground of difference between *for* and *law;* and so, misled by a false analogy, he avoids a hiatus by adding the same *r* to *law* in *lor and gospel* and the like; and he says *hollering* and *follering*, like *coloring*. There is nothing here that can be called an interchange; there is only a confusion in certain classes of cases, growing out of a general weakening and loss of the sound apparently interchanged.

As regards the two Cockneyisms referred to, there is a lamentable deficiency of authentic and trustworthy information. Neither of them is, so far as known, to be met with in this country; and our authorities on the subject are "Punch" and Dickens and their like—the humorists and caricaturists. Nor does Mr. Douse, though more favorably situated, appear to have any others to rely upon, or to have made any scientific study of the usages which he lays at the foundation of his theories. He contributes, however, one telling item of information as to the *h*-Cockneyism, which seems quite to deprive it of all value for his purposes, and to betray its true character. "With respect to the *h*," he says, "I have frequently observed a fact of some interest, viz., that when a group of deaspirators are talking together, an *h* is rarely heard at all; but when any of them begin to talk with people of superior education, they also begin to adorn their conversation with a frantic sprinkling of *h*'s in the wrong places, in order (as they suppose) to adapt their language to their listeners." It is readily seen what inferences we are to draw herefrom, and how far there is an analogy between this incorrectness of speech and the one already described, relating to the *r*. In both we have a widely extended loss of an element formerly uttered; but here, instead of a phonetic situation, causing a restoration of the lost letter in some cases, and its insertion by false analogy in others, we have a consciousness on the part of the speakers that in this particular they are talking wrongly and vulgarly; and, as a consequence of this, an unenlightened occasional attempt at bettering their practice. The necessary result is that their *h*'s are to no small extent "sprinkled in in the wrong places"; and also, of course, that a corresponding proportion of those which should be put in are still omitted. This naturally enough makes upon a correct speaker the general impression of an interchange; because his attention is more struck by the violations of correct speech, of either kind, than by the cases of conformity with his own practice: he distinctly hears every *h* wrongly added, and as distinctly misses every one omitted, while hardly noticing the others.

This is not put forward as a final or authoritative explanation; present information is too imperfect to permit that; but it is believed to satisfy better than any other the facts hitherto made known. And it is at least extremely probable that the asserted interchange of *w* and *v* is only a confusion of somewhat the same character, growing out of a dialectic rejection of the *v*-sound. If the case

is not so, the London phonologists have it in their power to demonstrate the contrary. But until this is done, at any rate, we have a right to distrust the capacity of the Cockneyisms in question to contribute anything toward the solution of that greatest of phonetic mysteries, the *lautverschiebung*, or rotation of Germanic mutes.

Mr. William S. Liscomb, of Providence, R. I., then presented a paper on "Forms of Assibilation."

The object of the paper was to trace the development of the *sh* sound, which is not primitive, but of later growth in all languages. Its nature is that of a *Zwischenlaut*, or "intermediate sound," standing between two others and gradually coming to take their place. We find its analogy in the vowel scale in the replacement of *ai* by *e* (as Sanscrit *vêda* for ***vaida***), and of *au* by *o* (as Latin *Clau*dius and *Clo*dius; Latin *causa*, Italian *cosa*).

Assibilated forms fall into two classes:

First, those in which the result of the assibilation is a simple sound, *sh* or *zh*, the two holding to each other the relation of *surd* and *sonant*. The former lies between and replaces (1) *sy*; e. g. *sure* (= ***sh***oor), originally = ***sy***oor (Eng. *y* being *yoo*); *luxury* (= *luc**sh**oory*), originally = *luc**sy**oory*: (2) *sχ* (*χ* representing the palatal heard in German *ich*); e. g. A.-S. *fi**sc**, **sc**rift*, flattening out into *fisχ*, *sχrift*, give Eng. *fi**sh**, **sh**rift*. In like manner the sonant *zh* comes from *zy*; e. g. *azure* (= *a**zh**er*), originally = *a**zy**oor*. When *zh* comes from *sy*, *s* first passed into *z*.

The vowels *e* and *i*, standing between *s* or *z* and a following vowel, naturally sink to *y* and with the *s* or *z* form *sh* or *zh*. Thus A.-S. *blŷ**si**an*, becoming *blŷ**sy**an*, gives Eng. *blu**sh***; *nau**sc**ous*, (originally = *nau-se-ous*), becoming *nau-**sy**ous*, gives *nau**sh**ous* (as pronounced). So *fusion*, *grazier* (once *fu-zi-on*, *gra-zi-er*), gave *fu**zy**on*, *gra**zy**er*, and finally *fu**zh**on*, *gra**zh**er*.

Similarly, *e* and *i* between *sc* or *sk* and a following vowel sink to *y*, the *c* and *k* flatten into *χ* and drop out, and *sy* forms *sh*. The steps are as follows: A.-S. ***sc**eacan*, *fi**sc**ean*; ***sc**yacan*, *fi**sc**yan*; ***sχ**yacan*, *fi**sχ**yan*; ***sy**acan*, *fi**sy**an*; ***sh**aken*, *fi**sh**en*; ***sh**ake*, *fi**sh***. The *y* sound was parasitic and often absent from the spelling; e. g. A.-S. ***sc**atteran*, ***sc**ulder*, Eng. ***sh**atter*, ***sh**oulder*. This explains words like A.-S. ***sc**eddan* and ***sc**iftan*, Eng. ***sh**ed* and ***sh**ift*, in which *e* and *i* are not followed by a vowel. *Sh* has often come from *ti*, *ce*, *ci*, as in *na**tion**, o**ce**an, spe**ci**al*. This occurs mostly in French words, in which these letters had already acquired the *sy* sound as in modern French.

Second, those in which the result of the assibilation is a compound sound, *tsh* and *dzh*, as heard in *bea**ch**, bri**dge***. These, which again are relatively surd and sonant, lie between and replace *ty* and *dy* respectively, the *t* and *d* being drawn backward into the mouth and the *y* being drawn forward to *sh*. It must be borne in mind that the *t* and *d* in the combinations *tsh* and *dzh* are not the ordinary *t* and *d*, being formed farther back toward the throat, instead of on the gums of the upper front teeth. Here, too, the vowels *e* and *i*, sinking to *y*, often produce the assibilation. Thus A.-S. *fe**ti**an*, becoming *fe**ty**an*, gives Eng. *fe**tch**; sol**di**er* (originally *sol-di-er*) passed through *sol**dy**er* to *sol**dzh**er* (as pronounced); Lat. *di**u**rnus*, sinking to ***dy**urnus*, gives old Fr. *jorn* and *jor*, Eng. *jour*(*nal*) (old Fr. *j* and soft *g* = *dzh*).

In Romance words *dzh* has often come from a primitive *y* sound which has taken before it a parasitic *d*. Thus Latin *juvenis, juxtare* (= *yuvenis, yuxtare*), became ***dy**uvenis, **dy**uxtare,* whence old Fr. *jone, juster* (the new Fr. *jeune, jouter*).

More frequently *tsh* and *dzh* have come from *cy* (or *ky*) and *gy* respectively, the *c* and *g* first passing into *t* and *d*, as in Gr. *πράκγω, πράττω* (through *πράτγω*), Lat. *suspi**c**io, suspi**t**io.* This change is due to the difficulty of forming *c* and *y* when the back of the mouth is set for *y*, the desired letter being made with the front of the tongue, which gives *t* and *d*. Thus A.-S. *bea**lc**ian, he**g**ian,* pass through *bea**lcy**an, he**gy**an,* to *bea**lty**an, he**dy**an,* then into Eng. *be**lch**, he**dg**e.* The *y*, which is parasitic, is often absent from the spelling; e. g. Lat. *ca**rn**-em,* becoming *c**y**arn-em,* gives old French *c**h**arn* and *c**h**ar* (the new Fr. *chair*). This explains words with the vowels *e* and *i*, like A.-S. *c**i**ld, c**e**se,* passing through *c**y**ild, c**y**ese,* and *t**y**ild, t**y**ese,* to Eng. *c**h**ild, c**h**eese.*

Besides these well defined classes, considerable irregularity exists in the origin of many assibilated forms. The different classes also cross into each other, as *cabbi**sh*** and *cabba**ge**, partri**dg**e* and *partri**ch**, debo**sh*** and *deba**nch**.* Italian shows assibilation of *di* to *dz*, as Lat. *ra**di**om,* It. *ra**zz**o* (*zz* = *dz*), and Italian and German show assibilation of *ti* to *ts*, as Lat. *na**ti**on-em,* It. *na**z**ione* (*z* = *ts*), Ger. *na**t**ion* (*ti* = *ts*). There is no sufficient evidence that either Latin or Greek anciently possessed true assibilation, though the former developed it at a later date.

In High German assibilation appeared in the eleventh century and has had a somewhat irregular development. Among the Low German dialects it is known only to English and Platt-Deutsch, and as a dialectic variation of the old Frisian. It is an important element in all the Romance and the Slavonic languages.

Professor C. H. Toy, of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., read the next paper, on "The Nominal Basis of the Hebrew Verb."

As far as regards the form, the Hebrew verb is ultimately identical with the noun. Certain words, as *ayin, yesh,* are obviously substantives, the imperative is a noun without pronominal suffixes, the ground-form of the verb, *kataba,* has simple nominal inflection of gender and number, and the derived forms arise by prefixes (*na, ta, ha,* etc.) and in other ways after the manner of nouns. In the imperfect the third masculine singular (*yi.ktob* = *ya.ktubu*) comes from the stem by prefix *ya,* which is by some regarded as the third personal pronoun; but this is against the analogy of the perfect (which has no pronominal addition in third singular masculine), and no such masculine personal pronoun as *ya* is found, while nouns are often made by this prefix and the imperfect resembles the noun in its endings (*a, i, u*) and otherwise. In the third singular feminine the prefix *ta* resembles the feminine sign, but its position is against identifying it with this, and rather points to the nominal prefix *t*. The second and first persons are made by prefixed pronouns, the second singular feminine has the feminine addition *i* or *i.n,* the plural of the third and second has the nominal plural terminations. The internal vowel-changes and the significance of the *ya* and *ta* are difficult to explain. The preference of the imperfect for prefixes springs perhaps from the fact that the ground-form (*ya.ktubu*) is thus made. The nominal base seems to be concrete.

In the syntax also a prominence of the nominal conception is visible. Besides the preference for infinitive constructions, there is the peculiar use of the participle in circumstantial clauses, the occurrence of the verb after a noun in *stat. const.* and as qualifying a noun (imperfect), the descriptive imperfect with ו alongside of the infinitive with ל, the general development of the verb (without elaborated temporal and modal forms), the paucity of conjunctions, and the statuesque character of the syntax.

The Committee to nominate officers for the next year presented nominations as follow:

For *President*—Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

For *Vice-Presidents*—Professor J. B. Sewall, Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass.; Professor C. H. Toy, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.

For *Secretary and Curator*—Professor Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

For *Treasurer*—Mr. Charles J. Buckingham, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

For additional members of the *Executive Committee*—

Professor Frederic D. Allen, University of Ohio, Cincinnati, O.

Professor W. W. Goodwin, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.

Professor F. A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Penn.

Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.

Professor W. D. Whitney, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

The report was accepted, and the persons therein named were declared elected to the offices to which they were respectively nominated.

On motion,

Resolved, That the thanks of the Association be given to the Secretary and Curator for his past services; and that, in consideration of the labors of his office, he be allowed the coming year the sum of $200 for clerical assistance.

On motion, the Executive Committee was desired to take into consideration the propriety of setting a limit to the time within which abstracts or papers may be sent to the Secretary for publication.

A recess was then taken till 2½ o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Association met after the recess.

Professor W. D. Whitney presented a report from the Committee appointed in 1875 to take into consideration the whole matter of the Reform of English Spelling, and continued after its Report in 1876 for one year with Professor F. A. March as Chairman, as follows:

The attempt to prepare an English alphabet according to the principles laid down in the Report of last year brings out the following facts.

1. There are eighteen Roman letters which commonly represent in English nearly the same elementary sounds which they represented in Latin: *a* (*f*ather), *b*, *c* (*k*, *q*), *d*, *e* (m*e*t), *f*, *g* (*g*o), *h*, *i* (p*i*ck), *l*, *m*, *n*, *o* (g*o*), *p*, *r*, *s* (*s*o), *t*, *u* (f*u*ll).

2. The consonant sounds represented in Latin by *i* and *u* are now represented by *y* and *w*, and the sonants corresponding to *f* and *s* are now represented by *v* and *z*.

3. There are three short vowels unknown to the early Romans which are without proper representatives in English, those in *fat*, *not*, *but*.

4. There are five elementary consonants represented by digraphs: *th* (*th*in), *th* = *dh* (*th*ine, *th*en), *sh* (*sh*e), *zh* (azure), *ng* (si*ng*); to which may be added *ch* (*ch*urch), *g* (*j*).

It seems best to follow the Latin and other languages written in Roman letters, in the use of a single sign for a short vowel and its long, distinguishing them, when great exactness is required, by a diacritical mark.

The alphabet would then have thirty two letters.

Twenty-two of these have their common form and power as described above in statements 1 and 2.

The three vowels in *fat*, *not*, *but* need new letters. Without laying any stress on the exact form, it is recommended to try some modifications of *a*, *o*, and *u*, such as ɑ, σ, υ.

For the consonants now represented by digraphs new letters would be desirable, but no particular forms are now recommended. The following are mentioned: *đ*, đ (then); þ, ƀ (thin); f, fi (sh); ǯ (zh); ŋ (ng); č (ch).

The use of these letters with only these powers and the dropping of silent letters will so change the look of large numbers of words that they will not be recognized at sight. It seems necessary therefore that there should be a transition period, and for that the following suggestions are made:

1. Transition characters may be used resembling, if possible, two letters:

For *a* in *fate*,	ɑ	may be used in place of				ē.
" *e* " *mete*,	ė	"	"	"		ī.
" *i* " *fine*,	ị	"	"	"		ai.
" *u* " *pure*,	ū or ụ	"	"	"		iu.
" *s* " *as*,	ƨ	"	"	"		z.
" *g* " *gem*,	ɡ	"	"	"		j.
" *c* " *cent*,	ç	"	"	"		s.

2. The digraphs now representing single consonants may be named and otherwise treated as single letters.

3. New letters can be easiest introduced by using them only for the old letters which they resemble in form.

4. Long words bear changes best, and vowels are more easily changed than consonants, which project more above and below the line. Dropping final silent *e* is the easiest change.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the Committee on the Reform of English Spelling be continued for one year.

The Committee on the place and the time of the next meeting recommended that the next meeting be held at Saratoga, N. Y., on Tuesday, July 9, 1878, unless the Executive Committee shall deem it advisable to fix upon some other place of meeting, in which event reasonable notice shall be given by the Secretary.

On motion, the report of the Committee was accepted, and the recommendation therein contained was adopted.

On recommendation of the Executive Committee, it was

Resolved, That the Association expects, in the interest of the timely appearance of its publications, that members who have read papers before it will be prompt in sending abstracts and copies of such papers at the call of the Secretary; and it authorizes and requests the Secretary to wait no longer than till October 15th for any abstract for the Proceedings, and no longer than till January 1st for the copy of any paper intended for the Transactions, but to close up and issue the Proceedings and the Transactions as if the delinquent papers had not been presented.

Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull presented a paper on "A Mistaken View of the Process of Word-making in the American Languages."

Major John W. Powell laid before the Association his Notes and Vocabularies of Indian Dialects.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the thanks of this Association are hereby tendered to the Trustees and the Faculty of the Johns Hopkins University for the use of their buildings and their courteous attentions during this meeting, to the Local Committee for the completeness of their arrangements for our comfort, to those citizens of Baltimore who have contributed to our entertainment, and to the Athenaeum Club for the handsome reception given us in their rooms.

On motion, the Association adjourned.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1877-78.

PRESIDENT.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

J. B. SEWALL,
C. H. TOY.

SECRETARY AND CURATOR.

SAMUEL HART.

TREASURER.

CHARLES J. BUCKINGHAM.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The officers above named, and—

F. D. ALLEN,
W. W. GOODWIN,
F. A. MARCH,
J. HAMMOND TRUMBULL,
W. D. WHITNEY.

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

Frederic D. Allen, Mt. Auburn, Cincinnati, O.
Joseph H. Allen, Cambridge, Mass.
William F. Allen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Joseph Anderson, Waterbury, Ct.
N. L. Andrews, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.
Samuel J. Andrews, Hartford, Ct.
S. P. Andrews, 75 West Fifty-fourth street, New York.
W. H. Appleton, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.
Albert N. Arnold, Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
George Francis Arnold, Brookline, Mass.
Cecil F. P. Bancroft, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
Stephen G. Barnes, Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa.
John G. Barton, College of the City of New York.
Charles C. Bates, Plymouth, Mass.
H. Louis Baugher, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.
Nehemiah W. Benedict, Free Academy, Rochester, N. Y.
John Binney, Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Ct.
J. B. Bittinger, Sewickly, Pa.
G. R. Bliss (Crozer Theological Seminary), Lewisburg, Pa.
Porter C. Bliss, office of "Library Table," New York City.
James R. Boise, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
James P. Boyce, Southern Baptist Theol. Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
W. F. Bradbury, High School, Cambridge, Mass.
Charles E. Brandt, Farmington, Ct.
H. G. C. Brandt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Fisk P. Brewer, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.
John A. Broadus, Southern Baptist Theol. Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
Charles J. Buckingham, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
L. H. Buckingham, English High School, Boston, Mass.
John C. Bull, American Asylum, Hartford, Ct.
Elihu Burritt, New Britain, Ct.
Horatio Q. Butterfield, Olivet College, Olivet, Mich.
Henry A. Buttz, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.
Richard E. Call, Mohawk, N. Y.
W. B. Carr, Petersburg, Va.
Franklin Carter, Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
William C. Cattell, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Talbot W. Chambers, 70 West Thirty-sixth street, New York.
Henry L. Chapman, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Elie Charlier (Life Member), Institute for Young Men, Central Park, New York.

Francis J. Child, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
John Storer Cobb, 69 William street, New York.
Lyman Coleman, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
George F. Comfort, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
Jacob Cooper, New Brunswick, N. J.
William B. Corbyn, Quincy, Ill.
A. Crittenden, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Howard Crosby, University of New York (116 East 19th street), New York.
Edward P. Crowell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
H. A. Dearborn (Tufts College), Malden, Mass.
Mrs. M. W. De Munn, Providence, R. I.
Schele de Vere, University of Virginia, Va.
Mary C. Dickinson, 173 Madison street, Toledo, O.
Martin L. D'Ooge, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.
E. S. Dulin, Stephen's Female College, Columbia, Mo.
Morton W. Easton, East Tennessee University, Knoxville, Tenn.
B. H. Engbers, Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, Cincinnati, O.
George R. Entler, Franklin, N. Y.
Carl W. Ernst, Providence, R. I.
O. M. Fernald, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Leon C. Field, Concord, N. H.
J. B. Feuling, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Gustavus Fischer, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
M. M. Fisher, Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.
Alexander Fleischmann, Cazenovia Seminary, Cazenovia, N. Y.
William W. Fowler, Durham, Ct.
J. N. Fradenburgh, State Normal School, Mansfield, Pa.
Homer T. Fuller, St. Johnsbury Academy, St. Johnsbury, Vt.
Horace Howard Furness, 222 West Washington square, Philadelphia, Pa.
William L. Gage, Hartford, Ct.
William T. Gage, Hartford Female Seminary, Hartford, Ct.
James M. Garnett, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.
Merrill E. Gates, Albany Academy, Albany, N. Y.
B. L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
D. C. Gilman, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Edwin Ginn, Boston, Mass.
Frederick B. Ginn, Boston, Mass.
William A. Goodwin, Portland, Me.
William W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Richard T. Greener, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.
James B. Greenough, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
J. M. Gregory, Illinois Industrial University, Champaign, Ill.
Ephraim W. Gurney, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
S. S. Haldeman (University of Pennsylvania), Chickies, Pa.
Horatio Hale, Clinton, Ontario, Canada.
G. C. Hall, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, O.
Charles Hammond, Monson Academy, Monson, Mass.
Lucian H. Hammond, Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pa.
James H. Hanson, Classical Institute, Waterville, Me.

Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
William R. Harper, Denison University, Granville, O.
Calvin S. Harrington, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Ct.
Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Ct.
Willabe Haskell, Bucksport, Me.
B. J. Hawthorne, State Agricultural College, Corvallis, Oregon.
Theophilus Heness, School of Modern Languages, Cambridge, Mass.
Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Newport, R. I.
George O. Holbrooke, Trinity College, Hartford, Ct.
E. S. Holden, U. S. Naval Observatory, Washington, D. C.
Alvah Hovey, Theological Seminary, Newton, Mass.
Albert H. Hoyt, 18 Somerset street, Boston, Mass.
Selah Howell, Christian Biblical Institute, Stanfordville, N. Y.
Milton W. Humphreys, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
John T. Huntington, Trinity College, Hartford, Ct.
William H. Jeffers, Wooster College, Wooster, Ohio.
Alexander Johnson, New Brunswick, N. J.
Edwin E. Johnson, Trinity College, Hartford, Ct.
John L. Johnson, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss.
J. C. M. Johnston, New Haven, Ct.
Edward S. Joynes, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.
Asahel C. Kendrick, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
Robert P. Keep, Williston Seminary, Easthampton, Mass.
John B. Kieffer, Mercersburg College, Mercersburg, Pa.
D. B. King, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Louis Kistler, North-western University, Evanston, Ill.
Charles R. Lanman, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Albert G. Lawrence, Newport, R. I.
L. M. Lawson, 4 Wall street, New York.
U. W. Lawton, Jackson, Mich.
J. S. Lee, St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y.
R. F. Leighton, Leipzig, Germany.
John M. Leonard, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
John R. Leslie, Newport, R. I.
D. P. Linsley, Fernwood, Pa.
William S. Liscomb, Providence, R. I.
Abiel A. Livermore, Unitarian Theological Seminary, Meadville, Pa.
Charles Louis Loos, Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va.
Thomas R. Lounsbury, Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
Rebecca S. Lowrey, 162 West Forty-seventh street, New York.
Merrick Lyon, University Grammar school, Providence, R. I.
W. G. McCabe, Petersburg, Va.
Joseph H. McDaniels, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
Edward H. Magill, Swarthmore College, Philadelphia, Pa.
Irving J. Manatt, Denison University, Granville, O.
Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
D. S. Martin, Rutgers Female College, New York.
Dan Marvin, Jr., 149 Lafayette avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
R. H. Mather, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.

Washington Matthews, New York.
Cyrus V. Mays, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.
Charles M. Mead, Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.
John Meigs, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Augustus C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York.
Joseph Milliken, Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College, Columbus, O.
E. C. Mitchell, Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
A. H. Mixer, Rochester University, Rochester, N. Y.
William L. Montague, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Charles D. Morris, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
F. A. Muhlenberg, Univ. of Penn. (4307 Walnut street), Philadelphia, Pa.
Thomas C. Murray, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Joseph H. Myers, Milton-on-Hudson, N. Y.
Bennett H. Nash, 62 Boylston street, Boston, Mass.
Francis Philip Nash, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
C. W. Nassau, Lawrenceville, N. J.
C. K. Nelson, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.
William M. Nevin, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.
S. M. Newman, Taunton, Mass.
Cyrus Nutt, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
C. M. O'Keefe, 45 Willoughby street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Howard Osgood, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.
Charles P. Otis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.
W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Lewis R. Packard, Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
William A. Packard, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
E. G. Parsons, Sumner Academy, South Byfield, Mass.
Tracy Peck, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
William T. Peck, High School, Providence, R. I.
William C. Poland, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Noah Porter, Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
Samuel Porter, National Deaf-Mute College, Washington, D. C.
John W. Powell, Washington, D. C.
Sydney P. Pratt, 7 Pemberton square, Boston, Mass.
Charles W. Reid, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
De Witt T. Reiley, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
William A. Reynolds, Wilmington, Del.
H. B. Richardson.
Leonard W. Richardson, Trinity College, Hartford, Ct.
W. G. Richardson, Central University, Richmond, Ky.
Matthew B. Riddle, Theological Institute of Connecticut, Hartford, Ct.
Ezekiel G. Robinson, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Edwin R. Ruggles, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Lawrence Rust, Kenyon College, Gambier, O.
Julius Sachs, Classical School, 4 West Forty-seventh street, New York.
George W. Samson, Rutgers Female College, New York.
A. Duncan Savage, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Wesley C. Sawyer, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis.
Philip Schaff, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

J. W. Schermerhorn, Bond street, New York.
Henry Schliemann, Paris, France.
John S. Sewall, Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.
Jotham B. Sewall, Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass.
Thomas D. Seymour, Western Reserve College, Hudson, O.
Joseph Alden Shaw, Highland Military Academy, Worcester, Mass.
John G. Shea, New York.
James W. Shearer, Liberty Corner, New Jersey.
L. A. Sherman, Hopkins Grammar School, New Haven, Ct.
J. A. Shores, Connecticut Literary Institute, Suffield, Ct.
Charles Short, Columbia College, New York.
Samuel S. Shute, Columbian University, Washington, D. C.
Hiram W. Sibley, Rochester, N. Y.
E. G. Sihler, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Leopold Simonson, Hartford, Ct.
H. H. Smith, Shelbyville, Tenn.
E. Snyder, Illinois Industrial University, Champaign, Ill.
Ephraim G. Squier, 135 East Thirty-ninth street, New York.
A. B. Stark, Logan Female Institute, Russellville, Ky.
M. C. Stebbins, High School, Springfield, Mass.
Benjamin F. Stem, Classical Institute, Easton, Pa.
Frederick Stengel, School of Mines of Columbia College, New York.
William A. Stevens, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.
Edward F. Stewart, Easton, Pa.
Austin Stickney, Florence, Italy.
John Swinton, 134 East Thirty-eighth street, New York.
J. Henry Thayer, Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.
Mrs. Elizabeth Thompson, New York City.
William Thompson, Theological Institute of Connecticut, Hartford, Ct.
William E. Thompson, Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, Lima, N. Y.
Crawford H. Toy, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Ct.
Joseph A. Turner, Hollins Institute, Botetourt Springs, Va.
Francis W. Tustin, University at Lewisburg, Pa.
Edward H. Twining, State University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
William S. Tyler, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Milton Valentine, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.
James C. Van Benschoten, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Ct.
Addison Van Name, Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
C. Osborne Ward, 486 Adelphi street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Julia E. Ward, Mount Holyoke Seminary, South Hadley, Mass.
Minton Warren, High School, Waltham, Mass.
W. B. Webster, Military Institute, Norfolk, Va.
R. F. Weidner, Phillipsburg, N. J.
James C. Welling, Columbian University, Washington, D. C.
Henry G. Weston, Crozier Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.
J. B. Weston, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, O.
Mrs. A. E. Weston, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, O.
Albert S. Wheeler, Sheffield Scientific School, New Haven, Ct.

George H. White, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
John Williams White, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
W. H. Whitsitt, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Lexington, Ky.
William D. Whitney, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
J. Colver Wightman, Taunton, Mass.
Alonzo Williams, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Edwin H. Wilson, Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
C. T. Winchester, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Ct.
John H. Wright, Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College, Columbus, O.
Stephen J. Young, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Robert B. Youngman, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

2719-133